

**CITY OF GLOUCESTER CITY
MASTER PLAN REEXAMINATION REPORT**

SEPTEMBER 2002

XII. ADDENDUM

The Reexamination Report referenced herein has been amended by the comments included in the attached Decision Resolution. Since the preparation of the Reexamination Report in 2002, Holt Industries has been financially redefined, however the physical plant essentially remains the same and the subject matter contained in the Reexamination Report should remain unaltered.

Additional comments by the Planning Board are referenced in the Decision Resolution and are hereby adopted as amendments to the text in this report.

**CITY OF GLOUCESTER CITY
MASTER PLAN REEXAMINATION REPORT**

SEPTEMBER 2002

This Addendum has been prepared to clarify points raised by Robert Dewechter, a member of the Planning Board, who summarized issues regarding the Master Plan Reexamination Report prepared in September 2002.

The comments are reflected in Mr. Dewechter's letter to Planning Board Chairman John Bisconti, dated March 13, 2003. The comments are addressed in the order presented in the letter, which is included as part of the Addendum for reference purposes.

LAND USE ELEMENT

- A. Holt Complex - Items 6, 7 and 8. Appear to be identified for priority consideration by the Planning Board.
- B. Market and Monmouth Streets Enhancement "Mini" Corridor. From the evaluation of the section, the elements in the original Master Plan calling for upgrades of the Market and Monmouth Streets in terms of enhancement of the corridors continues to be a focus of the Planning Board and the community.
- C. West Broadway. In this category, Item 1.d. and 1.e. are referred to as Board Priority. No changes need to be made. Reference is made to Item 2.a. "Board needs to be cautious of further aggravating a high density area". Accordingly, language under C.2., Action Items, a. has been changed to read as follows,

Housing for commercial development consistent with river front recreational uses. Such action shall be taken without further aggravating existing high density conditions. Therefore, further housing development shall be supported with replacement and upgrading of existing units or appropriate infill housing. Thus, equaling or lessening existing density.

In the same section, reference is made to 2.g. and 2.h. These are assumed to be focus items for special consideration by the Board pursuant to the lowering of density concept previously discussed. In Section C. West Broadway 1.b., It is indicated in Mr. Dewechter's letter that the interpretative program funding request has been denied. Accordingly, this is duly noted, however it is also recommended that an application be resubmitted for interpretative historic program funding. In section C. West Broadway, 1.c. - Mural Ordinance, commentary should be corrected that an Ordinance has been *adopted* to define a murals program.

**CITY OF GLOUCESTER CITY
MASTER PLAN REEXAMINATION REPORT**

SEPTEMBER 2002

- D. Riverfront Recreational Redevelopment Area - A new section D.6. has been added to read,

Riverfront recreational opportunities exist only when present industrial land can be allocated for that purpose. Therefore, the City must weight Item D.5., the expansion of the riverfront recreational district against the existing industrial uses and assess the projected results based upon financial impact and land use implications. An analysis is warranted.

- E. West Broadway District. These items appears to be focus items addressed to the Planning Board's attention requiring no amendatory action.

- F. Gloucester Point Redevelopment Area. A new section 3.e. has been added to read as follows:

The Gloucester Point Redevelopment Area, aka Southport Redevelopment Area, has historically been considered and classified for industrial waterfront development. Market forces, problems with access, environmental issues and regional competition have impeded the timely realization of these goals. Accordingly, a change of focus needs to be validated to test the feasibility for pursuing planned residential commercial waterfront recreational development. Defining such a goal should be the objective of future planning in the community.

This language embraces the comments provided in the letter of March 13, 2003.

- H. Broadway Avenue Corridor Redevelopment Area, Items 3 and 4 appear to b focusing the Planning Board's attention for priority consideration of upgrading the area around the Municipal Building at Broadway Avenue and Monmouth Street as a prototype area and upgrading the shopping area of the community.
- I. Newton Creek West, under general comments, refers to a greenbelt along Newton Creek and recommends continued enhancement of that area and appears to be a focus item for the Planning Board to consider.
- J. Newton Creek Community Complex, again appears to be a focus item for the Planning Board to consider regarding upgrades of the facilities.
- K. East Broadway District refers to truck signage, speed enforcement and similar issues. Commentary under K.3. has been changed to read as follows:

A signage program should be developed to identify and designate truck free routes in this area. Appropriate ordinances should be enforced. *If they are not in*

**CITY OF GLOUCESTER CITY
MASTER PLAN REEXAMINATION REPORT**

SEPTEMBER 2002

existence, necessary truck route ordinances should be written. Coordinate this with the Gloucester City Police Department.

O. Evaluate Rt. 130 Corridor, appears to be a focus item for the Planning Board.

General Comment - Reference to the SID throughout the Plan reflect the fact that the SID program was in effect during the period of the Plan's preparation. Subsequent to the preparation of the Plan, the SID was terminated in the City. Accordingly, references to the SID should be discounted. However, it should be noted that SIDs throughout the State provide a valuable instrument by which to upgrade the proposals, not only in the Master Plan, but also in the Reexamination Report and therefore consideration should be given to replacing the funding from the SID with other specialized funding to enable parking and urban design enhancements for the City's critical commercial corridors. An evaluation of the validity of SID for more limited and targeted areas should be considered.

HOUSING PLAN ELEMENT

A review of the Housing Plan Element Comments made in the subject letter dated March 13, 2003 appear to be focus items for members of the Planning Board.

The attached comments should be incorporated as part of the Addendum to the Reexamination Report as an element of the Board's commentary regarding the Reexamination Study.